

#13
5-2-02



500.35360CX1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

MAY 02 2002

Technology Center 2600

Applicants: Y. ICHIFUJI et al.
Serial No.: 09/418,822
Filed: October 15, 1999
For: BROADCASTING AND COMMUNICATION RECEIVER
APPARATUS
Art Unit: 2614
Examiner: L. Lo

LETTER TO THE OFFICIAL DRAFTSPERSON TRAVERSING
OBJECTION TO DRAWINGS ON FORM PTO-948

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

April 26, 2002

Sir:

It is respectfully requested that the application be forwarded to the PTO draftsman for review of this paper before the Examiner issues another Office communication so that the Examiner can advise the applicants of the PTO draftsman's decision in the next Office communication.

The drawings filed on October 15, 1999, were objected to on the form PTO-948 dated December 13, 1999, attached to the Office Action of June 20, 2001, with the following explanation being provided by the reviewing draftsman:

Solid black shading not permitted.
Fig(s) 8, 9

In the paper entitled "Letter to the Official Draftsman Traversing Objection to Drawings on Form PTO-948" filed on October 22, 2001, the applicants traversed this

objection to the drawings on the grounds that Figs. 8-9 do not have any solid black shading as alleged on the form PTO-948, and requested that requested that the objection to the drawings on the form PTO-948 be withdrawn, or should the objection be maintained, that the draftsperson provide a detailed explanation of the objection pointing out what the draftsperson considers to be solid black shading in Figs. 8-9.

On page 14 of the Office Action of December 26, 2001, the Examiner states as follows:

It is noted that applicant has requested that the draftsperson provide a detailed explanation of the objection pointing out what the draftsperson considers to be solid black shading in Figs. 8-9.

It is informed that the element 503₁ and 503₂ in Fig. 8 and 9, which are considered to be solid black shading, whereof the Fig. will show crowding and unclear of those elements when the drawing is reduced in size two-thirds in reproduction. Thus the objection from the draftsman is maintained.

However, it is submitted that Figs. 8-9 will not "show crowding and unclear of those elements [503₁ and 503₂] when the drawing is reduced in size two-thirds in reproduction" as alleged by the PTO draftsperson via the Examiner on page 14 of the Office Action of December 26, 2001, for the reasons discussed below.

The present application is a continuation of application Serial No. 08/844,831 which issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,037,995. Attached hereto are copies of sheets 6-7 of the drawings of U.S. Patent No. 6,037,095 showing Figs. 8-9 which

are identical to Figs. 8-9 of the present application which were objected to on the form PTO-948. It is submitted that it is readily apparent that elements 503₁ and 503₂ in Figs. 8-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,037,995 do not "show crowding and unclear of those elements [503₁ and 503₂]".

In light of this, it is submitted that Figs. 8-9 of the present application will not "show crowding and unclear of those elements [503₁ and 503₂] when the drawing is reduced in size two-thirds in reproduction" as alleged by the PTO draftsman via the Examiner on page 14 of the Office Action of December 26, 2001.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings on the form PTO-948 be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

Paul J. Shwartz Reg. NO 32,173 for
Melvin Kraus
Registration No. 22,466

MK/RSS
(703) 312-6600

Attachments